DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 256 RC 013 567

AUTHOR Swift, Doug
TITLE New Mexico's Very Small School Districts.
SPONS AGENCY New Mexico State Dept. of Education, Santa Fe. Div. of Public School Finance.
PUB DATE 29 Jul 82
CONTRACT 70-S-165
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the New Mexico School Administrator's Meeting (Albuquerque, NM, July 29, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Art Education; Cooperative Programs; *Core Curriculum; Educational Finance; *Educational Needs; Educational Planning; *Educational Status Comparison; Elementary Secondary Education; Expenditure Per Student; Multigraded Classes; *Operating Expenses; Rural Schools; *Small Schools; *State Standards; Student Teacher Ratio; Teacher Certification; Teacher Housing; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *New Mexico; School District Size; Waivers

ABSTRACT

The report addresses characteristics and concerns of New Mexico's 19 smallest school districts with a 1981-82 average daily membership ranging from 262 to 60 students. Information was gathered from a Public School Finance Division questionnaire sent to the 19 superintendents; from a December 1981 meeting with 10 of the smallest districts; from budget materials; and from 1981-82 State Department of Education records. Among the areas addressed in the summaries of the 18 returned questionnaires were unmet needs, staff development, priority concerns, program concerns, cooperative instructional services/programs, and legal constraints which prevent adequate programming. Problem areas and solutions discussed include: insufficient funding, inadequate housing, multiple certification/endorsement requirements, inter-agency or district communication, shared services, educational standards, and transportation funds. Budget materials are used to provide a comparison between 19 school districts and 4 larger school districts in relation to salaries, cost per pupil, pupil-teacher ratio, enrollment and teacher trends, and combined grades. State Department records provide information on the 19 school districts in terms of New Mexico Educational Standards, teacher certification, program waivers, program offerings (science, math, foreign language, art, vocational education, and physical education), and support services (libraries and counseling). (AH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED220256

New Mexico's

Very Small School Districts

Doug Swift

July 1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Doug Swift
Emmett Shockley
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Paper presented at the New Mexico School's Administrator's Meeting (Albuquerque, NM, July 29, 1982).

RC 013567

This paper was prepared as a part of Contract Number 70-S-165 with the State of New Mexico, Department of Finance and Administration, Public School Finance Division. The opinions expressed are those of the author; no official endorsement by the State of New Mexico, the Secretary of Finance and Administration, or the Public School Finance Division should be inferred.

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Perceptions of School Superintendents:
PSF Questionnaire 4

Perceptions of the School Districts from
the December Meeting 11

Information Obtained from Budget Materials 13

Information from the State Department of Education 19

Comments 21

Recommendations 25

Appendix 28

References 30

Introduction

This paper addresses some of the characteristics and concerns of New Mexico's small school districts and their concomitant small schools. There are 19 districts considered in this paper, with average daily membership (ADM) in 1981-82 ranging from 262 to 60 students. The high school (grades 7-12) membership in these districts range from 123 to 25 students.

It may be appropriate to think in terms of very small school districts, for the literature of small schools in general is limited to districts with enrollments of more than 300 students. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) does not report statistics for districts of fewer than 300 students--except to note that in the fall of 1977, there were 4,296 school districts with enrollments of fewer than 300 students. These school districts represented 26.7% of the districts in the United States, but the total enrollment accounted for 1.2% of the total public school enrollment, grades K-12 (Dearman and Plisko, 1979, p 78).

Similarly, the 19 New Mexico districts with fewer than 300 students (1981-82) represent 21% of the school districts in the State, and their total enrollments represent 1.2% of the New Mexico public school enrollment, grades K-12 (Public School Finance best of 40/80-day enrollment figures).

Budgeted operational expenditures (1.XXX through 16.XXX) for these 19 districts totaled $14.6 million, representing 2.3% of the statewide budgeted operational expenditures. The budgeted expenditures in the 19 districts represent $4,975 per student compared with a statewide average of $2,491 per student (Statistics, 1980-81, pp D-20 through D-94).

There have been recurring requests from the very small districts, however, for adjustments in the funding formula which would cause additional funds to flow to the very small districts--particularly those that benefited little or not at all from the high school size adjustment amendment of 1981 (Chapter 87, Laws of 1981). It was a theme of a meeting of small school administrators and board members in December 1981 which representatives of 10 of the 19 districts attended. It was a topic presented to the December 1981 meeting of the Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC). And it was a concern expressed in the House version of HB 2 of the 1982 session.

In an attempt to determine whether or not a need exists for additional funds in the very small districts, and to explore alternative funding strategies, a group of people was brought together under the auspices of the Director of Public School Finance.

Representatives of the Public School Finance Division (PSF), LESC staff, and the State Department of Education (SDE) have met to explore the need and alternatives. As a part of the effort, PSF sent a questionnaire to the 19 superintendents and the responses were discussed at many of the school budget hearings. The recommendations made and possible solutions identified at the December meeting of small school

administrators and local board members were perused, and information available from PSF and SDE were analyzed.

There are many fine programs and attributes--curricular and extracurricular, intentional and unintentional--in very small school districts. If all were well, however, there were be no need for additional funds. This paper, then, deals with the problems of the very small districts as perceived primarily by the personnel of these districts. All of the material reviewed and conversations remembered for this paper originated, directly or indirectly, in the very small districts. Where perceptions of others are reported they are so identified.

This paper summarizes the data gathered, presents some comments of the author in regard to the data, and provides some suggestions for further work. The next major step must be to work with and among the very small districts to identify feasible solutions to concerns, and to develop strategies for implementing solutions. The goal, of course, is improved effectiveness in the very small school districts of New Mexico.

Perceptions of School Superintendents: PSF Questionnaire

Eighteen superintendents responded to the PSF questionnaire. This section summarizes their responses.

1. Unmet needs. Almost all respondents mentioned curricular needs with "college prep" and vocational opportunities mentioned most frequently; opportunities for enrichment (music, art, drama) were mentioned next most frequently. Supportive services came in third and physical needs were fourth.

More specifically: science, foreign language (becoming a UNM entrance requirement), and computer education were among the needs mentioned for college prep. Vocational education was mentioned without specific programs identified. Music and fine arts were most mentioned within enrichment programs.

Supportive services included special education ancillary services, counseling, and media services. Evaluation and curriculum development were mentioned also.

Physical needs included an activity bus, a gym floor, vocational facilities, life safety improvements, and accessibility. Only five respondents indicated unmet physical needs in their districts.

2. Staff development. Most of the districts conducted (and plan to conduct in 1982-83) activities which might be grouped under a heading of "improved instruction" with activities such as curriculum evaluation and planning, effective teaching, evaluation, articulation, and individualized instruction.

Some districts addressed, or will address, specific programs (home economics, math) and techniques (use of newspapers in the classroom, computer applications). A few activities are of the "nuts and bolts" type --necessary to but not a part of instruction--such as attendance policies, classroom control, handbook revisions, reduction in force.

It is difficult to know content of staff development activities from a two-or-three-word description. It appears, however, that only three districts had (or plan) staff development activities that address the unmet needs of the district, as specified in the response to the first question.

3. Top concerns. From a list (including "other"), superintendents were asked to identify the top five concerns "preventing your district from offering a comprehensive program." The results are tabulated in Table I.

Table I

Top Concerns Which Prevent a Comprehensive Program as Identified by Superintendents.

16	Multiple Certification/Endorsement
15	Lack of Housing
10	Noncompetitive Salary Schedule
9	Lack of Community Activity, Other Employment Opportunities
8	Lack of Certified Personnel
5	Staff Turnover
5	Inadequate Community Resources
5	Lack of Supportive Services
3	Staff Competency
1	Inadequate Equipment
0	Inadequate Supplies

Other concerns mentioned included declining enrollment, rural isolation, transportation, additional funding, and number of teachers to meet educational standards.

4. Solutions developed to meet program needs. Superintendents indicated a variety of methods, some of which might be considered innovative, to meet program needs of students. These include:

a. Artist in the Schools;

b. contracted librarian for consultant services to school library;

c. two-year alternating class schedule;

d. mini-courses;

e. Upward Bound and swimming program with local university;

f. Centro Campesino health services;

g. directed study in specialized areas;

h. correspondence courses for credit;

i. student aides and student tutors;

j. cross-over college credit with local university;

k. credit for private music instruction;

l. teachers-as-counselors;

m. individualized instruction;

n. extensive use of field trips;

o. combined classes; and

p. combined grade levels.

Many superintendents mentioned administrative actions which they considered as solutions to meeting program needs of the students. These include:

a. careful attention to scheduling;

b. careful attention to recruiting teachers with needed certifications and endorsements;

c. involving teachers in planning;

d. progress reports every four weeks on students not performing to expectations;

e. four-day school week;

f. improved salaries in order to attract top teachers;

g. encouraging teachers to gain additional endorsements; and

h. all high school teachers teaching seven periods per day.

5a. Cooperative instructional programs/services. A majority of superintendents reported special education diagnostic and/or ancillary services are provided on a cooperative or shared basis. In other areas, the following were mentioned:

a. drivers' education;

b. use of evening school in adjoining district;

c. Title I/Migrant;

d. music;

e. health services;

f. Artist in the Schools;

g. vocational programs with Area Vocational Schools;

h. contract services for drivers' education; and

i. cooperative bidding and ordering.

5b. Barriers to cooperative programs/serivces. Superintendents identified the following barriers:

a. distance (time and cost);

b. lack of qualified personnel;

c. lack of funds;

d. personnel do not want to work in two or three systems; and

e. skepticism about "part-time" staff.

6. Legal (statutory, regulatory) constraints which prevent offering an adequate student program. Sixteen superintendents, in question #3, identified certification as one of the top five concerns. Thirteen superintendents mentioned certification in responding to question #6 as a "legal constraint" to an adequate program. Many mentioned only certification; others were more specific:

a. regulations are too strict;

b. prohibits use of local expertise;

c. each science endorsement (biology, chemistry, physics, etc.) requires 24 hours in subject area;

d. difficulty in obtaining provisional (one-year) certificates;

e. regulations too strict for vocational certification;

f. credit hours required for endorsement in "nonacademic" areas--drivers' education, music, art, etc.; and

g. cannot use teachers in nonendorsed areas, even though teacher has knowledge of the subject.

Other legal constraints mentioned included (with each mentioned only once):

a. teachers may resign with thirty days notice--last-minute resignations hurt;

b. cannot use general obligation bond funds to build teacher housing;

c. compulsory attendance law;

d. legislative mandates; and

e. changing regulations of the State Fire Marshall.

7. Steps to make most cost-effective use of facilities/classrooms.

Comments included:

a. combined classes;

b. new heating and cooling systems;

c. community use of facilities;

d. purchase of equipment from districts with declining enrollment;

e. purchase of equipment from government agencies which are closing down;

f. maintenance personnel obtaining plumbing and electrical licenses to eliminate costly purchased services in these areas;

g. automatic or manual turning off heat one-half hour before end of day; turn on one hour before start of classes;

h. decreased heat loss through added insulation, new doors, lowered ceilings;

i. replace incandescent lamps with fluorescent fixtures;

j. four-day school week; and

k. close excess buildings.

Perceptions of the School Districts from the December Meeting

Representatives of ten of the smallest school districts met in Las Cruces on December 3, 1981. Four groups were formed, and each group identified problems and possible solutions. The results were distributed to the participants and are summarized in this section.

1. Problem: insufficient funding to permit

   a. adequate staff to meet educational standards;

   b. competitive salaries;

   c. retention of teachers;

   d. adequate funds for operational costs (operational costs are uncontrollable); and

   e. specialized services.

   Possible solutions:

   a. funding formula change, including possibility of removing utility costs from the formula; and

   b. state provide specialized services.

2. Problem: inadequate housing.

   Possible solutions:

   a. permit SB 9 levy to be used to purchase or construct staff housing; and

   b. permit use of critical capital outlay funds for housing.

3. Problem: obtaining teachers with multiple certification/endorsements.

   Possible solutions:

   a. teacher training institutions encourage multiple certification and endorsements;

   b. change certification requirements;

c. modify salary schedule to recognize multiple endorsements (and modify the T&E factor to recognize the increased cost of recognizing multiple endorsements);

d. relax educational standards to permit use of local expertise without regard to certification; and

e. investigate the possibility of "rural certification."

4. Problem: lack of communication among agencies and school districts.

Possible solutions:

a. establish better communications between agencies and between boards and agencies (SDE, NMSBA, NMSA, PSF,...school boards, and superintendents); and

b. encourage more active participation of local board members in attending meetings, lobbying, etc.

5. Problem: shared services--library, guidance, nursing, advanced courses, drivers' education,....

Possible solution: SDE work with districts in determining shared-service needs and possibilities.

6. Problem: education standards.

Possible solution: study by SDE to determine if Education Standards are appropriate to rural (small) districts.

7. Problem: inadequate transportation funds.

Possible solution: review transportation funding policies in light of needs of very small districts.

Information Obtained from Budget Materials

All of the information contained in this section is from budget information pertaining to the 1981-82 school (and fiscal) year.

1. Salaries. Ten of the 18 superintendent respondents indicated non-competitive salary schedules to be among the top five concerns (Table I). Comparisons of salary schedules among the 19 school districts and with four larger school districts were made. The larger districts were Penasco (784 ADM), Moriarty (1,394), Las Cruces (14,871) and Albuquerque (73,784). These comparisons are contained in Table II.

From Table II, based solely on salary considerations, it appears that beginning salaries in the smallest districts are competitive with the larger districts. This is true at BA/0 years experience and at BA+15/4 years experience. Beyond that point, however, salaries in the 19 districts appear to fall behind the four comparison districts with substantial disparities at the MA+15/12 years experience and MA+45/16 years experience levels. Such disparities offer strong incentives to relocate--other things being equal.

At each level, however, there is at least one of the small districts which provides a salary higher than the highest salary of the comparison district. One might conclude, then, that it is possible for a small district to offer competitive salaries--if that is a priority of the district.

Because of the relatively large range of salaries at each step in the 19 districts, it is instructive to compare ranges and averages among the central quartiles of the 19 districts and with the comparison districts. The central quartiles had been chosen on the basis of the salaries at BA+45 or MA/8 years experience. These comparisons are shown in Table III.

Table II

Comparison of Salary Schedules in the Smallest 19 School Districts and in Four Larger School Districts.

	19 Smallest Districts	4 Larger Districts
Average Salary		
Range	$14,688-20,621	$16,657-19,140
Average	$17,447	$18,168
BA/0 Years		
Range	$12,075-14,802	$12,600-14,172
Average	$13,597	$13,554
BA+15/4 Years		
Range	$13,850-16,629	$14,450-15,888
Average	$15,180	$15,284
BA+45 or MA/8 Years		
Range	$14,742-18,675	$16,282-18,412
Average	$16,851	$17,355
MA+15/12 Years		
Range	$15,340-21,551	$19,080-20,420
Average	$18,237	$19,865
Post MA or MA+45/16 Years		
Range	$15,750-24,955	$21,632-22,515
Average	$19,593	$22,017

Table III

Comparison of the Salary Schedules in the Central Quartiles of the 19 Smallest School Districts and in 4 Larger School Districts.

	11 Districts (Central Quartiles)	4 Larger Districts
Average Salary		
Range	$15,736-18,750	$16,657-19,140
Average	$17,331	$18,168
BA/0 Years		
Range	$12,980-14,223	$12,800-14,172
Average	$13,685	$13,554
BA+15/4 Years		
Range	$14,349-16,268	$14,450-15,888
Average	$15,207	$15,284
BA+45 or MA/[illegible] Years		
Range	$15,970-18,029	$16,282-18,412
Average	$16,843	$17,355
MA+15/12 Years		
Range	$17,195-19,958	$19,080-20,420
Average	$18,253	$19,865
Post MA or MA+45/16 Years		
Range	$18,100-21,635	$21,632-22,515
Average	$19,604	$22,017

From Table III, it is apparent that the majority of the smallest districts are competitive at beginning salaries, but fall behind the larger comparison districts as both training and years of experience increase. Although it appears that two or three districts remain competitive across the salary schedule, the majority of the smallest districts do not.

The salary information from which Tables II and III were extracted may be found in the Appendix.

2. Pupil-Teacher Ratios. The 19 smallest school districts have a pupil-teacher ratio (PTR) substantially lower than in the four larger school districts, as indicated in Table IV.

Table IV

Comparison of Pupil-Teacher Ratios (PTR) in the 19 Smallest School Districts and in 4 Larger School Districts.

	19 Smallest Districts	4 Larger Districts
Districtwide PTR		
Range	8.28-14.58	18.46-22.40
Average	11.45	18.77
High School (Grades 7-12) PTR		
Range	7.08-12.73	19.58-21.91
Average	10.12	20.28

The information from which Table IV is derived is found in the Appendix.

3. Program Cost Per Pupil. The program cost per pupil, based on 40/80-day ADM, for the 19 districts as compared with the four larger districts, is shown in Table V.

Table V

Program Cost Per Pupil in the 19 Smallest Districts and in 4 Larger Districts.

	19 Smallest Districts	4 Larger Districts
Program Cost Per Pupil		
Range	$2,790-3,827	$1,779-2,132
Average	$3,374	$2,091

At a value of $1,405 per unit, each student in the 19 smallest districts range in "worth" from 2.00 to 2.72 units; students in the four larger districts range in worth from 1.27 to 1.52 units. The information from which Table V is derived is found in the Appendix.

4. Enrollment and teacher trends. All of the 19 districts but three anticipate a decreased enrollment in 1982-83 as compared with 1981-82. Ten of the districts anticipate maintaining the 1981-32 teaching staff; six districts will increase teachers somewhat. Only three districts anticipate a reduced number of teachers. Six districts project a decrease in students equal to or more than the PTR--but only one of these districts intends to reduce teaching staff. Three of the districts will maintain 1981-82 staff, while two districts intend to increase staff.

5. Combined grades. Thirteen of the 19 smallest school districts combine one or more elementary grades; more combinations exist in the smaller schools. Within the 19 school districts:

a. if elementary school enrollment is 66 or fewer students (including kindergarten), one or more grade levels are combined; and

b. if elementary school enrollment is 81 or greater, grade levels are not combined.

Information from the State Department of Education

Except where noted, all of the information in this section pertains to the 1981-82 school year.

1. Approval. All of the 19 school districts under consideration are approved for the 1981-82 school year by the State Department of Education in accordance with New Mexico Educational Standards.

2. Teacher certification. According to records of the SDE, eight of the 19 districts have teachers with one-year certificates; nine districts have requested and, apparently, have been granted certification waivers. It is not clear, however, whether a certification waiver is considered a deficiency.

3. Program waivers. SDE records indicate that two of the 19 districts have program waivers: one for lack of a foreign language program and one relating to inservice days.

4. Program offerings. SDE information was provided for 18 of the 19 districts under consideration.

   a. Science. One district offers no lab science. Eight districts, however, offer two lab sciences, and two districts offer one lab science in addition to chemistry and/or biology.

   b. Mathematics. Among the categories of algebra, geometry, and advanced math, one district offers none of these courses; eight districts offer only algebra or geometry; eight districts offer advanced math, but five of these do not offer either algebra or geometry.

   c. Foreign language. Six districts do not offer a foreign language.

   d. Art and fine art. Five districts have no offerings in this area; 10 have one offering; three have two offerings.

e. Vocational education. Educational Standards require at least one vocational skill program in high schools of up to 200 students. According to 1980-81 information from the vocational education unit, one of the 18 school districts provides no skill training vocational program; 11 districts offer one program, and six districts offer two programs. In addition, all of the districts offer at least one exploratory vocational program, 16 of the districts offer two or more exploratory programs. Some of the districts offer industrial arts.

f. Physical education. The requirement for physical education is met in every district--some many times over.

The information from the SDE may be a "snapshot" and may not reveal courses taught back-to-back.

5. Support services.

a. Libraries. All but four of the districts indicate library services with most of these served by part-time librarians. It may be that services are provided in the four districts, but librarians, as such, are not employed.

b. Counseling. Ten of the 18 districts do not provide counseling services--at least no person is employed to provide these services. Services may be provided by teaching counselors or by administrators, but such information does not appear on the SDE information.

Comments

The author has had an interest in small schools and small districts for a number of years (see Swift, 1978 and 1980). In preparing this paper, the following comments came to mind.

1. In the superintendents' questionnaire, only one mentioned cooperative programs with Area Vocational Schools; only two mentioned cooperative programs or arrangements with local universities. Programs or agreements with Branch Community Colleges were not mentioned. Yet, 10 of the 19 districts are within 32 miles of a public postsecondary school--university, community college, or AVS. Cooperative programs with postsecondary schools, however, are relatively common, particularly in San Juan County, Lea County, and with Luna Technical-Vocational Institute.

2. Salaries in the very small districts do not remain competitive. Compounding the problem is the need for multiple certification/endorsement. Teachers with multiple endorsements and certificates are likely to have advanced degrees and teaching experience which command higher salaries in the larger districts than in the smaller districts.

The lower PTR in the smallest districts is more a happenstance than by design. A comprehensive program in all districts, large and small, requires teachers endorsed in a number of areas. There is a practical limit to the number of endorsements a person may hold--as well as a limit to the number of classes which a teacher may meet in one day. Hence a lower PTR is necessary in small school districts.

There is a strong correlation (r = .85) between district enrollment and PTR.

	ADM	PTR	
$\bar{x}$	155	11.20	
s	55.7	1.92	
r		.85	(significant at $p \ll .01$)

As enrollment declines, the smallest school districts find it difficult to reduce the numbers of teachers commensurately. Although resources per student increase as enrollment decreases (due to size adjustment), the increase may not be sufficient to maintain both low PTR and competitive salaries.

Nevertheless, small districts which place a priority on salaries will increase PTR (reduce teaching staff), as indicated below.

	PTR	Salary (MA/8 Years)	
$\bar{x}$	11.20	$16,851	
s	1.92	$ 1.307	
r		.56	(significant at $p < .02$)

Thus among the smallest districts, those which reduce the number of teachers pay higher salaries; those which maintain teaching staffs pay lower salaries.

3. Elementary school enrollment declines to an average of 11.6 students per grade level before action is taken to combine grade levels. When combinations occur, generally all students of one grade level are combined with all students of an adjacent grade level. There is only one instance of half-and-half combinations, for example, one classroom of grades 2 and 3, another classroom of grades 3 and 4. The smallest elementary schools are two-classroom units.

4. Six districts have neither certification waivers nor teachers with one-year certificates. Yet, superintendents in five of the six districts included certification among the top five concerns preventing the district from offering a comprehensive program. All groups at the December meeting identified certification as a problem area.

5. All 19 districts, in the view of the SDE, meet the state's Educational Standards, although some waivers have been granted--most relating to certification. From the questionnaires and the December meeting, however, most superintendents believe the districts are not providing an adequate, comprehensive program. The comments from some districts would indicate the districts may be deficient in meeting educational standards.

The most-mentioned program concerns included foreign languages, art and fine art, and advanced science programs. The perceptions of the author in regard to these areas are as follows:

a. In small districts, every teacher must be able to "double in brass." It is difficult to find teachers endorsed in foreign language and in appropriate, additional teaching areas.

b. Art and fine art occupy a low priority among all the various programs which "should" be offered. When program variety must be reduced, art and fine art are among the first to go.

c. School programs are subject to supply and demand pressures. If the demand is insufficient for advanced science and math, say, they will not be offered in preference to programs where demands are high. Exploratory vocational education and physical education appear to be high demand programs in most of the 19 districts.

6. Not contained in the materials received specifically for this paper but heard in discussions among and about small school districts is a philosophical split regarding assistance from larger districts. The extreme positions may be stated thus:

a. Whatever we do, we must do among ourselves. If a larger district is involved, the larger district tries to run the program as it perceives the program should be run rather than in response to our needs.

b. We should involve the larger districts. They have the expertise and resources to give us the help we need.

Perhaps both positions are correct--but are situationally specific.

7. Also heard in discussions, although not contained in material reviewed specifically for this paper, are three concerns (barriers) to shared programs.

a. Which district is responsible for hiring, evaluation, salary determination, fringe benefits,...?

b. Although a school teacher may be employed full-time, each district perceives the teacher as a part-timer who therefore is not accepted fully by the staff and community--perhaps not even in the teacher's "home" community.

c. Shared programs are considered a step toward consolidation. A shared program is an indication that a district cannot do it all by itself.

8. No one mentioned, neither in the superintendents' questionnaire nor in the December meeting, that unmet program needs might be met through technology. Broadcasting (radio and TV), telecommunications nets and data links may be ideas whose times have not yet come.

Recommendations

This paper had identified a number of concerns common to very small school districts in New Mexico. The paper also identifies a variety of ways in which some school districts are attempting to alleviate their concerns, both within the boundaries of the individual districts and through cooperative ventures with adjacent school districts and with nearby postsecondary institutions. The paper also identifies some creative solutions to common concerns which should be pursued.

1. It is suggested that this paper serve as a common base for superintendents and board members of very small school districts to enter into discussions which will permit each to build on the experience of others in

   a. adopting/adapting successful methods and techniques within school districts; and

   b. developing shared and cooperative programs with other school districts and nearby postsecondary institutions.

2. It may be that some such programs may incur expenses beyond those of the "regular" program. It is recommended that the superintendents and board members of the very small districts collectively approach and work with PSF in exploring alternative funding sources for excess costs incurred by innovative programs designed to improve the quality and effectiveness of education in the very small districts.

3. Housing was identified as one of the top five concerns by 15 superintendents. A number of districts in the state, however, have teacherages in the vicinity of isolated schools. It is recommended that the small districts

who perceive housing to be a significant problem explore the feasibility of establishing teacherages within their districts.

4. Certification is a pervasive concern across the very small districts. It is recommended that superintendents and board members of very small school districts identify specific areas of concern and work collectively with the Education Standards Commission and teacher training institutions to alleviate certification problems.

5. Enrollment trends. Although there is some evidence of a "back-to-the-country" movement, the enrollment trend in most of the very small school districts is down. (Since 1979-80 to the projection of 1982-83, the trend would be characterized as down in 13 of the 19 districts, relatively stable in five districts, and up--slightly--in one district.) One district reached a point, both financially and programmatically, where it could not continue its high school. The district will operate as an elementary district with a projected enrollment of 32 students. It is recommended that:

a. legislation relating to consolidation be reviewed with a view toward encouraging consolidation when a district can no longer provide an adequate, comprehensive program. Consolidation decisions should be made while viable choices remain rather than when it becomes imperative.

b. legislation be enacted which requires school districts to be unified--offer grades K-12. Absent such legislation, the state someday may have a number of districts which operate only elementary schools.

6. The recommendations contained herein require communications. To facilitate communications, it is recommended that PSF, LESC, and SDE, other organizations concerned with education such as NMSBA, NMSA, and teacher organizations sponsor continued activities to foster communications and resolution of the concerns of the very small districts.

7. There are sufficient concerns which require concerted action to require priorities to be determined--not all concerns can be addressed at once. A group of representatives from each of 19 districts may be so large as to be ineffective. Committees or task forces, each charged with responsibility (and authority?) for a specific issue may be appropriate. The December 1981 meeting in Las Cruces resulted in a number of creative solutions to a number of areas of concern. These should be explored further.

8. Whatever is done, it must be done by or at the behest of the very small school districts. As Edington (1982) points out, the involvement of the schools and communities is essential. Technical assistance may be needed, but it should be provided on request and where needed. Locally-initiated and -financed programs are more successful in small rural schools than those initiated from outside with large amounts of financing. Finally, the structure of small districts is often quite informal which can enhance adoption; but the people involved have many jobs which may slow implementation. Patience is required.

SMALL SCHOOL GENERAL INFORMATION

6 25 82

DISTRICT	(1) 1981-82 ADM	(2) # TCHRS	(3) PTR	(4) PROGRAM COSTS	(5) PER PUPIL COST	(6) 7-12 ADM	(7) 7-12 TCHRS	(8) 7-12 PTR	WAIVERS PROG.	WAIVERS CERTIF.	1 YR. CERTIF.
Logan	262.00	18.00	14.56	$731,084	$2,790.40	121.50	10.80	11.25			1
Melrose	235.50	18.75	12.56	758023	3,218.78	123.50	10.31	11.98		1	
Quemado	234.75	16.10	14.58	737,563	3,141.91	103.50	8.10	12.78		1	
Lake Arthur	205.25	16.27	12.62	687,598	3,350.05	114.00	9.27	12.30		3	1
Hondo	185.00	18.00	10.28	674,416	3,645.49	90.00	11.00	8.18			
Dora	184.00	16.80	10.95	596,954	3,244.32	82.50	8.80	9.38	1	2	
Floyd	181.00	14.15	12.79	606,413	3,350.35	103.00	8.15	12.64			1
Vaughn	180.75	13.40	13.49	616,615	3,411.42	87.00	7.40	11.76			
Wagon Mound	165.50	13.50	12.26	591,123	3,571,74	92.00	8.25	11.15			
Des Moines	141.50	12.10	11.69	479,146	3,386.19	67.50	7.53	8.96		3	1
Grady	134.50	11.65	11.55	453,207	3,369.57	74.00	6.90	10.72		1	
Elida	131.00	14.55	9.00	437,575	3,340.27	60.00	8.55	7.02		1	
San Jon	130.84	12.76	10.25	465,474	3,557.58	63.00	5.22	12.07			
Corona	122.50	11.51	10.64	450,380	3,676.57	63.50	6.76	9.39			
Maxwell	121.00	13.75	8.80	448,131	3,703.56	65.00	7.50	8.67	1		1
Roy	101.00	11.40	8.86	363,843	3,602.41	45.00	7.00	6.43		1	1
House	85.50	8.86	9.65	301,885	3,530.82	39.00	4.86	8.02		1	1
Mosquero	83.50	8.30	10.06	306,613	3,672.01	45.00	4.64	9.70			
Encino	60.00	7.25	8.28	229,606	3,826.77	25.50	3.60	7.08			1
GROUP TOTAL	2,945.09	257.10	11.45	$9,935,649	$3,373.63	1,464.50	144.64	10.12	2	14	8
Penasco	784.00	35.00	22.40	1,632,585	2,082.38	471.00	21.50	21.91	2	2	3
Moriarty	1,394.00	69.00	20.20	2,481,040	1,779.80	684.50	34.94	19.59	1	5	1
Las Cruces	14,870.50	738.02	20.15	28,502,222	1,916.70	7,009.50	327.85	21.38		18	4
Albuquerque	73,784.25	3,997.00	18.46	157,301,390	2,131.91	35,645.50	1776.06	20.07		93	60
GROUP TOTAL	90,832.75	4,839.02	18.77	$189,917,237	$2,090.85	43,810.50	2160.35	20.28	3	119	67

SOURCES: Columns 1,4,6 and 8 are from Public School Finance 1982-83 Budget Analysis Worksheets
Columns 2 and 7 from PSF Form #40
Columns 3 and 5 were calculated and the Waiver information came from SDE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

33

33 A

References

Nancy B. Dearman and Valena White Plisko, The Condition of Education, 1979 Edition. Washington DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1979.

Everett D. Edington, "The Factors Affecting the Adoption and Implementation of Innovations in Rural Schools." Unpublished MS. Paper presented to the National Diffusion Network Meeting, Washington DC, June 15, 1982.

Educational Standards for New Mexico Schools. Santa Fe: State Department of Education, May 1981.

Statistics, Actual 1980-1981, Projected 1981-1982. Santa Fe: Public School Finance Division, Department of Finance and Administration, December 1981.

Doug Swift, An Analysis of Size Adjustment Factors in the New Mexico Public School Funding Formula. Unpublished study conducted for the Public School Finance Division, February 1978. (ED 210 129)

Douglas Swift, Size Adjustment Factors in the New Mexico Public School Funding Formula: A Policy Analysis. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of New Mexico, December 1980.

SMALL SCHOOL SALARY INFORMATION

6 25 82

1981-82

DISTRICT	1981-82 ADM	Average Salary	Av. Yrs. Experience	BA 0 yrs.	BA+15 4 yrs	BA+45 MA/8yr	MA+15 12 yr.	Post MA MA+45/16
Logan	262.00	$17,932	8.0	$13,593	$15,870	$18,676	$21,551	$24,955
Melrose	235.50	19,549	11.4	13,952	16,394	18,347	19,603	20,509
Quemado	234.75	17,709	8.3	14,700	16,451	18,307	20,105	21,296
Lake Arthur	205.25	17,294	7.9	14,000	15,400	17,200	18,600	19,600
Hondo	185.00	20,621	13.8	14,802	16,629	19,240	21,067	22,894
Dora	184.00	17,482	10.2	14,200	15,700	16,900	18,000	19,100
Floyd	181.00	17,293	11.0	13,545	14,944	16,202	17,878	18,718
Vaughn	180.75	17,510	9.0	13,254	14,349	16,925	18,044	20,498
Wagon Mound	165.50	18,750	14.6	14,423	16,268	17,945	19,958	21,635
Des Moines	141.50	15,750	11.9	12,075	13,775	15,475	16,725	17,775
Grady	134.50	17,236	9.7	13,409	14,522	15,970	17,231	19,094
Elida	131.00	14,688	9.0	13,014	13,986	14,742	15,498	16,254
San Jon	130.84	16,693	9.6	13,210	14,698	16,323	17,812	19,302
Corona	122.50	18,445	9.6	14,137	15,816	18,029	19,940	21,352
Maxwell	121.00	17,323	14.2	12,980	14,982	16,698	18,311	19,551
Roy	101.00	15,736	8.0	13,310	15,205	16,370	17,195	18,100
House	85.50	14,956	5.3	13,220	14,190	15,255	15,824	17,200
Mosquero	83.50	16,877	13.0	14,072	15,392	16,711	17,810	18,690
Encino	60.00	18,652	17.8	12,450	13,850	14,850	15,350	15,750
Penasco	784.00	18,661	11.0	14,172	15,888	18,412	20,177	22,170
Moriarty	1,394.00	16,657	6.7	14,152	15,612	16,282	19,782	21,632
Las Cruces	14,870.50	19,140	11.4	13,090	15,185	18,064	20,420	22,515
Albuquerque	73,784.25	18,214		12,800	14,450	16,660	19,080	21,750

SOURCE: Average Salary - Years of Experience from PSFD Printout (Average Teacher Salary Information)
Salary Schedule information from PSFD

BEST COPY AVAILABLE